



ATTORNEY DOCKET: 40526.10001
PATENT

THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Stephen B. Maguire :
Serial No.: 10/066,338 : Group Art Unit: 1723
Filed: 31 January 2002 : Examiner: D.L. Sorkin
For: LIQUID COLOR PUMPING METHOD :
AND SUPPLY APPARATUS :

Charles N. Quinn
Reg. No. 27,223
Customer No. 34661
Fox Rothschild LLP
2000 Market Street, 10th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Tel: 215-299-2135
Fax: 215-299-2150
Email: cquinn@foxrothschild.com
Deposit Account: 50-1943

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT

Sir:

Introductory Remarks

This is submitted in response to an official action bearing a mailing date of 24 May 2005 in which the examiner noted that claims 25 and 26 had been allowed, but rejected claims 1 through 24, 27 through 30, 49 through 52 and 68 through 82 on various bases, and further noted that claims 31 through 48, 53 through 67 and 83 through 96 had been withdrawn from consideration.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1 through 24 and 27 through 30 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, and requests reconsideration of those claims in light of the amendments made to those claims herein and the remarks section of this paper.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 14 through 24 and 27 through 30 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, and requests further reconsideration of those claims in light of the amendments made to those claims herein and the remarks section of this paper.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 68 through 70, 72 through 74 and 77 through 82 under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by United States patent 3,957,399 to Siczek, and requests reconsideration of those claims in light of the amendments made to those claims herein and the remarks section of this paper.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 68 through 72, and 74 through 76 made under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by United States patent 2,606,696 to Miner, and requests reconsideration of those claims in light of the amendments made to those claims herein and the remarks section of this paper.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 49, 50 and 68 through 82 under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by United States patent 2,656,828 to Conover, and requests reconsideration of those claims in light of the amendments made to those claims herein and the remarks section of this paper.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 51 and 52 made under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentably obvious on the basis of United States patent 2,656,828 to Conover in view of United States patent 2,606,696 to Miner, and requests reconsideration of those claims in light of the amendments made to those claims herein and the remarks section of this paper.